REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **18 November 2005**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-8, 10-17 and 19-26. Claims 1, 3-5, 10, 12-14, 19, and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Gerard et al (USPN 6,442,753, hereinafter "Gerard"). Claims 2, 6-8, 11, 15-17, 20, and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerard in view of Li (USPN 5,787,275, hereinafter "Li").

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103

Independent claims 1, 10, and 19 were rejected as being anticipated by Gerard. In response to Applicant's remarks dated September 02, 2005, the Examiner noted that certain features upon which Applicant relied were not recited in the rejected claims of the instant application.

Applicant respectfully points out that although Gerard discloses the inclusion of a cache within a computer system (*see* Gerard, col. 5, line 5), the cache therein is a **general-purpose** cache. Such a cache stores recently used instructions and data, and is not used specifically for storing class-related information.

In contrast, the instant application teaches using a cache that stores **class dependency information**, such as a list of classes upon which a class depends (*see* FIGs. 2 and 3, and paragraphs [0032], [0034], and [0035] of the instant application). This is different from the system of Gerard, because the cache disclosed by Gerard **does not distinguish** class dependency information from other instructions and data, while embodiments of the present invention store only data relevant to the analyzed classes. The specialized cache for dependent classes in the present invention is beneficial because it provides the necessary data, and only the necessary data, for looking up class dependencies. There is nothing

9

within Gerard, either explicit or implicit, which suggests providing a cache which stores only the list of dependent classes including the name of the analyzed class.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 10, and 19 to clarify that the present invention provides a cache which stores only class dependency information. These amendments find support in FIGs. 2 and 3, and in paragraphs [0032], [0034], and [0035] of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 10, and 19 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-8, which depend upon claim 1, claims 11-17, which depend upon claim 10, and claims 20-26, which depend upon claim 19, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   _Edward J. Grundler_
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: February 14, 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665

11